

State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension Amendments, April 17, 2012

Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table

Ind	Pg	Location on page	Wording as submitted 2/1/12	Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12	Reason for change
4B	18	Discussion of Baseline Data for FFY 2010 using 2009-2010 data	<p>For FFY 2010, 829 districts had students with IEPs enrolled. One hundred thirty-one of these districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days for at least one racial/ethnic group. Of the 131 districts, 93 were newly identified and 38 had been identified using the previous methodology. One hundred seventeen districts were excluded from the calculation because they had fewer than 30 students with an IEP enrolled.</p> <p>Based on the Monitoring Selection Criteria, the OSE conducted 35 on-site reviews and 22 desk audits and 36 state verified self reviews of these districts' policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>.</p>	<p>For FFY 2010, 829 districts had students with IEPs enrolled. One hundred thirty-one of these districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days for at least one racial/ethnic group. One hundred seventeen districts were excluded from the calculation because they had fewer than 30 students with an IEP enrolled.</p> <p>Based on the Monitoring Selection Criteria, the OSE conducted on-site reviews, desk audits and state verified self reviews of these districts' policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>.</p>	Monitoring data clarification following submission of the SPP Extension and simplification of reporting.
4B	18	Discussion of Baseline Data for FFY 2010 using 2009-2010 data, third paragraph	After monitoring, 49 of the 93 districts were found to have inappropriate policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy. Fourteen of these districts had a significant discrepancy in more than one racial/ethnic group. Each of the 49 districts was issued findings of noncompliance in April or	After monitoring, 27 districts were found to have inappropriate policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy. Seven of these districts had a significant discrepancy in more than one racial/ethnic group. Each of the 27 districts was issued findings of noncompliance in April or December 2011. Upon notification of findings of	Monitoring data clarification following submission of the SPP Extension and simplification of reporting.

State Performance Plan (SPP) Extension Amendments, April 17, 2012

Michigan Amendments in Response to OSEP's Michigan Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Status Table

Ind	Pg	Location on page	Wording as submitted 2/1/12	Revised wording as submitted 4/17/12	Reason for change
			December 2011. Upon notification of findings of noncompliance, these 49 districts...	noncompliance, these districts...	
4B	19	Top of page in the Racial/Ethnic Group with Significant Discrepancy table	American Indian=3 Asian=1 Black=30 Hispanic=9 White=23	American Indian=1 Black=18 Hispanic=9 White=11	Monitoring data clarification following submission of the SPP Extension.
4B	19	Measurable and Rigorous Targets	Baseline=5.9% *(49 districts ÷ 829 districts with students with IEPs) X 100 = 5.9%	Baseline=3.3% *(27 districts ÷ 829 districts with students with IEPs) X 100 = 3.3%	Monitoring data clarification following submission of the SPP Extension.